ITAC Court Core Data Transfer Project
Meeting Notes

August 30, 2004

These notes follow a more structured Weekly Status Report posted 09/01/04 on the ITAC Virtual Office.

The meeting started with a quick review of the work assignments and a description of last week's documents, passed out or placed on the Virtual Office

Any additions to the Selection of Court Data Items Chart, either omission or changes, must now be submitted as additions to the agency's FINAL chart submission.

FINAL SUBMISSIONS OF ALL WORK PRODUCTS ARE DUE by Friday, September 3. All final submissions <u>must be electronic</u>. They include:
- Agency Descriptions of Court Data and Use
- Agency Selection of Court Data Items
- Agency Automated Documents Requirements
- Court Output / Display Descriptions

Those who wish to review the court data dictionary and other draft documents to review submissions by all agencies can visit the "**T.1**" section of the virtual office.

There was discussion of "charges" vs. "counts." The court indicated they were interchangeable terms if art. The court will prepare a description of "counts" for distribution.

The court announced their data conversion plans. They will convert **all felony back to 1978.** They will convert all misdemeanor cases back to 1978, but **will convert case history of misdemeanor cases only back 10 years.**

The courts indicated they were going to al numbering system for cases in the future. However, each type of case would have a prefix which would change should the type of case change. As this has led to confusion and severe data quality problems in the past, the courts were asked to re-examine the use of changeable prefixes.

The court explained it has no "body attachments" and that all bench warrants will be carried on the system.

The ITLO discussed his poor directions for the Selection of data Items Chart. Some agencies selected "query" for all data items they wished to see displayed as the result of a query. This was the intent of the directions. Other agencies selected "query" if they wanted that data to be indexable. The ITLO feels that both methods will work

satisfactorily, and the end result will not handicap those who selected data as only indexable items.

The ITLO indicated some agencies selected both "current" and "wish" for some data items. He eliminated the wish if "current" was selected, reasoning that if one received the data, there was no reason to "wish" for it. It was explained that when this occurred, the agency in question was currently getting the data, but only manually, they "wish" to receive it in an automated fashion in the future.

CSOSA and PSA presented how their systems would handle court data. The methodology will be described for the final report as their description of how court data should be displayed in response to a query. In brief, the court data is offered in segments on a screen. If the user wishes more information or more details, she/he selects that segment. Again a segmented screen appears, and if there is additional data available, they may further "drill" down into the information.

This was an excellent demonstration of an efficient and rapid way to both display and query information. Dennis Caravantes did an outstanding job!

The assignments for the next work session were discussed.

There will be no 09/06/04 Work Session. The next work Session will be on 09/13/04 – in the same room at MPD headquarters.

ASSIGNMENTS:

Agencies:

1) **Please** send final soft copies of all work products, either WORD or EXCEL to the moderator at earl.gillespie@dc.gov
2) Please review and complete your final 08/30/04 list of Court Data Items.
3) Please complete your final report/description of the agency view(s), opinions and/or presentations of how the new DCSC response to a query should be designed.
4) Please complete your final report of the automated documents and their transmission paths requirements chart.
5) Remember there is no 09/06/04 Work Session.

Courts:

6) The courts will finalize #2, but in "reverse", that is, their data requirements list will reflect court data requirements from agencies.
7) The courts will finalize #3, but in "reverse", that is, their query response will reflect court concepts and/or experiences from earlier phases of this project.

8) The courts will finalize #4, but in "reverse", that is, their automated documents and document flows requirements will reflect court document requirements from other agencies.

JUSTIS Staff

1. Remind participants **there is no 09/06/04 work session**.
2. Continue to update, correct and add to membership list
3. The Court Data Items list is to be completed by 09/06/04.
4. An aggregate Agency Court Data Items Requirements List is to be completed by 09/06/04.
5. An aggregate Automated Document Requirements Chart is to be completed by 09/06/04.
6. An Agency Description of Court Output Displays is to be completed by 09/06/04
7. Prepare and post a copy of the Meeting Notes from 08/30/04 CCDT Working Group.
8. Request **<u>final</u>** soft copies of all agency work products to be turned in by 09/03/04.
9. Prepared the DRAFT Final Report of the Court Core Data Transfer Working Group.
10. Prepare for the next CCDT meeting on 09/13/04.